The Modern Churchman.

No. 3. JUNE, 1916. Vol. VI.

PACIFIC

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

Annual Service and Meetings, July 6th, 1916.

12 noon. **Holy Communion** at St. Sepulchre's Church, High Holborn, E.C.
Preacher: The Rev. Hubert Handley.

3 p.m. **Public Meeting** in the Hall of Sion College, Victoria Embankment, E.C.
Chairman: Prof. Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Speakers: The Rev. Canon Streeter.
The Rev. H. D. A. Major.
Dr. Cyril Norwood.

4-30. **Tea.**

5 p.m. **Annual General Meeting** of Members of the Churchmen's Union.
Agenda: (1) Annual Report; (2) Accounts; (3) Election of President, Council, Treasurer, and Auditor; (4) Proposed Amendments to the Constitution and Rules; and any other business not requiring previous notice.

PREPARATION FOR THE NATIONAL MISSION OF REPENTANCE AND HOPE.

By the Rev. J. M. Wilson, D.D., Canon of Worcester.

There is a real danger that both in the preparation for the National Mission, and in the Mission itself, a very grave mistake may be made. We may easily come to regard it as a mission of the Church to the rest of the nation, to call them to repentance; and overlook the fact that it is also a call of God to the Church, to call the Church in particular to repentance. It is, indeed, quite obvious that this danger has become a

reality, and that the Mission is, to a large extent, so regarded both by ourselves and others.

Few mistakes in the preparation for the Mission will be more deadly than this way of regarding it; and yet this estimate of the Mission will be generally assumed, and is easily, to some extent, justified.

Who is to call the nation to God if not ourselves? The clergy and good churchpeople, of course, know very well that they are not as good as they ought to be; but they are, at any rate, religious; they do worship God; they do observe Sunday; they do live decent and kindly lives; they do not drink and swear and gamble. Are they not justified, and more than justified, in conducting a Mission to others?

But such an appeal coming from us, even if we have a clear message to deliver, will fall on deaf ears; we feel this instinctively, and we do not clearly see why. Those whom our appeal may reach, in meeting, or cottage, or street, or through print, can rarely formulate a reply. They oppose a silent passive resistance; they turn away; and neither they nor we quite know why. But our Mission will have little effect unless we find out why. To find out why is no small part of the work of our preparation.

It is a large question, obviously not to be dealt with as a whole in any single paper. But one or two points seem to me to stand out clearly, and I will endeavour to state them.

If we clergy and good churchpeople desire to be listened to by others, we must use the preparation time for listening intently for God's call to us: to *us* who are the spokesmen and representatives and teachers of the church; to *us*, the priests and communicant members of the church; to *us*, who should embody and manifest to the nation the spirit of Christ. And, in particular, if we want to lead others in the path of repentance, we must travel that difficult and sorrowful path ourselves, with bowed head and bleeding feet. Thus only shall we know how hard it is to repent. The old Horatian rule holds good:

Si vis me flere, dolendum est
Primum ipsi tibi.

If we clergy cannot go before our own congregations in this humble spirit; if our loyal communicants and church-folk cannot speak to one another, and to their own neighbours, in the same genuinely penitent spirit; if we, as yet, feel no real sting of conscience, see little in ourselves, or in our Church, to confess as very wrong, and to be repented of, neither will those to whom we go see anything in their way of life to confess, anything to repent of. If we come with the taint of the Pharisee in our inmost soul, thinking that we are at least relatively righteous, our efforts, though quite sincere, are doomed to failure. Of all people on earth we Churchmen ought to be the most penitent.

The first essential then, as it seems to me, in the preparation for the Mission, is to scrutinize *ourselves*, and try to ascertain, as in the sight of God, why we ourselves are so little attractive; and what defect it is that paralyzes us, and makes our message to the nation at large so unfruitful, though we have every conceivable advantage in delivering it.

How shall we begin so to scrutinize ourselves? Some of us may, if we are truly humble, get much help from our severest critics, without or within our body; they may help us to see ourselves as others see us. But experience shews that most of us clergy and Churchmen can never get rid of the belief that such critics are ignorant, prejudiced, unjust and even wicked. It needs rare humility and sympathy to use their criticisms. We must, I fear, mainly rely on a more faithful and intelligent and impartial examination of ourselves by the standard of Christ's spirit and life. But how can this be brought home to us? To what voices will the mass of Churchpeople listen? What voices are there that will so awaken the Church to its own sins and shortcomings, as to stir people to action? No voices will stir us except our own, the voice of the Holy Spirit within us.

This leads to the remark, often made, but which has so little affected the Christian conscience, that Christ lays far more stress on sins of omission than on sins of commission. He

would not condemn the woman taken in adultery. He did not reproach the penitent thief or the woman that was a sinner. But there stands out among his words the fate of Dives—who had no obvious fault but complacent comfort; and His stern judgment of those who "*did it not* to the least of His brethren." We do not, cannot quite forget, such passages as these, but they slip into the background. Habits are hard to change. New points of view are hard to acquire. But the Mission is to help us to face these hard tasks.

In many ways, as is obvious, we are protected from the most flagrant sins of commission; they are no temptation to us. We confess in church a string of such sins with a conscience quite unwrung. But where in our litanies of repentance do we specify and enumerate our own sins of omission? At such a time as this our intellects need to be pierced, our consciences awakened, by some searching exposure of what we leave undone. Simply because things are *not* done by ourselves or our friends; because they are *not* something glaring, flagrant, we do not see them, and never think of them. Let all of us search out and put before ourselves the good that we might have done, and did not do. We are as guilty for all that, as for the evil that we have actually done. Such sins of omission, thought out, stated to ourselves should, I venture to suggest, be the main subjects of our penitence at this time; and not penitence only, but repentance, *μετάνοια*, a complete change of mind, attitude, ideal, action.

It is very hard for us church folk to believe that it is these sins of omission which paralyze our influence with what we regard as the non-religious world. But so it is. That world does not call them "sins of omission;" it has no name for them; but they know the spirit of Christ when they see it in action; and they do not see it prevailing in the Church. Where they see it in individuals they love it, and honour it in the individual. And they see that it is unquestionably not the characteristic of Churchpeople *qua* Churchpeople, of the Church as a Church. My first point then is that clergy and good

Churchpeople must use these months of preparation in listening to the call of God to them to study and find out what it is that they are so fatally leaving undone; in humbling themselves before God, for their blindness in learning their failures, and strenuously endeavouring to remedy them. This is the true *μετάνοια*.

The second point is that one sphere is obvious in which our sins of omission have been very damaging to the influence of the Church and therefore of Christianity. We ought in the past to have shewn far more intelligent and active sympathy with the efforts of the working classes to apply Christ's principles to modern industrial and economic and social problems, as they affect religious life. A few names of prophets among us will occur to us all. But as a body we churchmen have stood coldly aloof; we have let the poor and oppressed fight for themselves; we have at best kept the ring; and too often our applause and sympathies have been on the wrong side. We cannot deny that Churchmen and Church-women have to a large extent, by their disheartening aloofness, if not by actual word, condemned the Labour movements for better conditions of life, as selfish, unworthy, materialistic, irreligious. We have failed to see them with the eyes of Christ; we have fastened on what is unlovely in them, and have been blind to the deep, unselfish, human, Christ-like element in them. It is our failure to see that social as well as individual salvation is part of Christ's message and ideal for the world, and is therefore our message—it is this, more than anything else, which has erected this intangible barrier, this remoteness, this sense of mutual unintelligibility, between the Church and the working men. They see that Jesus Christ was the friend of the poor and oppressed; and they see, what we do not see, that true friendship of the poor, in the spirit of Christ, demands to-day from a powerful organized, omnipresent body like the Church of England something more than individual Christians, more indeed than an individual Christ could give; something more than oil and wine to heal wounds and alleviate distress. They see that

friendship of the poor to-day in the Spirit of Christ demands the organized influence of His followers on the State to restrain the liberty of the hard and unscrupulous, and to secure preventive measures. That they see is wanting in us. They are not in the least misled by the prominence we often give to such subjects in conferences and congresses. They see that it all ends in talk, and pious wishes, and that our ideal of acquiescence and fatalism is not disturbed.

My paper is longer than I intended; but let me in conclusion put before you two or three aphorisms to consider. The late Professor Bruce said that "*Many men have left the Church in order to be Christians.*" He was not speaking of the Church of England only, but of any organized body of Christians. This was no wild and random epigram. It is the deliberate dictum of a wise and good man, and it is true. What a tremendous truth lies below that saying! Think of it!

Ruskin said that while the one only path to national prosperity and domestic peace was to understand what the will of the Lord was, and to do all they could to get it done; it seemed as if the eagerest preachers now-a-days held their blessed office to be that not of shewing men how to do their Father's will on earth. but *how to get to heaven without doing any of it.*

Is that too severe? How do we commonly use the phrase "Thy will be done"? Is not the Father's will the good of all His children, the full and abundant life that cannot come to the weak till the strong set themselves to do their Father's will and not their own.

Or think of what a late friend of mine, Charles Rowley, of Manchester, said—that the reason of the deplorable failure of the teachers of religion is that they have endeavoured for centuries *to make people think alike on a wide range of doubtful thought*, with such ever-widening divergence as we see; instead of combining them in action to suppress evils on which all good men could agree in principle. Nothing so leads to unity of faith in what is essential, as unity of action inspired

by that faith. It is he that does the will of God, that knows of the doctrine.

In a word the repentance of the Church must take the form of confession of past blindness to one of the main elements in the true ideal of the Church of Christ; it must also acknowledge that the firmest grip and clearest vision of that element in the ideal is to be found outside our own body; it must therefore resolve humbly to learn, to study, to combine in efforts for economic and industrial and social reform in the true spirit of Christ.

Let me recur for one moment to the Labour Movements.

We are greatly in error in thinking these movements irreligious, some are wholly religious. I wish for example more of us knew the Adult School Movement, a living and growing lay effort to present afresh Christ's message to the working world.*

Here is a movement nearly twenty years old, with some 80,000 members, quite independent of us, truly devotional and Christian, with its chief aims education, fellowship, helpfulness. Are we to ignore or speak disparagingly of this movement because it "followeth not us"?

Others again, though aiming openly at social and political changes, draw their moving power, and their ideals, from the Christian Spirit.

It will give new light to many on the religious spirit moving such reforms, if they will read a pamphlet, *Labour and Religion*, and see what Archbishop Lang and Bishop Talbot say of it.†

I can say no more now than that I believe that in the finest spirits of the Labour Movement can be found by some of us the truest inspiration for an element that may otherwise be fatally wanting in our preparation for the Mission, the recovery of a lost ideal for the Church, and with it a real repentance for the past, and a real hope and guidance for the future.

* The Secretary, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, will give all information, including the Lesson Sheet, and Handbook and Magazine—all of which can be got for tenpence.

† W. A. Hammond, Holborn Hall, Clerkenwell Road, E.C., price by post, 7d.

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE: AN APPRECIATION.

If the value of a teacher's work may be judged by numerical standards—by the multitudes he influenced, and the geographical area penetrated by his message, then the late Archdeacon Wilberforce must rank among the foremost champions of Credal Reform in the Church of England. The great message he delivered was rendered more effectual by his peculiarly advantageous position. As Archdeacon of Westminster, and Rector of St. John's, he possessed a practically untrammelled pulpit. Then he was the last of the celebrated Wilberforces, and owed to that gifted line much of the eloquence, sympathy, and personal charm which contributed so much to the success of his ministry. Basil Wilberforce, with a name which was in itself no small asset, a golden tongue, and a temperament that loved to champion unpopular causes was bound, from the days of his first curacy, to attract attention, and when in later life he essayed the re-interpretation of current religious beliefs, his success was quite as marked as that which had attended his earlier efforts in the field of social and temperance reform.

The work accomplished by the Archdeacon was no less important because it was popular in its scope. His illuminating ideas travelled far beyond the reach of his voice, which was heard almost exclusively in St. John's and the Abbey pulpits. His books went everywhere, even the little periodical which contained a monthly sermon was circulated in five or six countries. Had his work been more scholarly its lasting value would probably be greater, but it would assuredly have lost in attractiveness and extent of appeal.

It is true that he has contributed nothing to the domain of accurate theology; his mind was philosophical, but it owed little to current philosophy; he was zealous for the recon-

struction of Christian doctrine, but the contributions of the latest scholarship formed no part of his reconstructive ideas.

In what, then, did his power and usefulness consist? First and foremost, in the vivid, spiritual quality of his personality. It has been said of him, with some truth, that *he was* the sermon; his sonorous and majestic eloquence, his broad and philosophic utterances were but modes of the expression of *himself,* and that self, in certain moods, was great, far-seeing, intensely alive to spiritual values.

Moreover, he spoke of what he *knew experimentally.* He has been regarded in some quarters as merely a clever echo of other men's ideas; only those who were strangers to him could speak thus, for one of his most marked characteristics was the fervent intensity of his spiritual convictions. Numbers were attracted by this very intensity to the man "who was so tremendously sure of God," and caught from him something of its exalted contagion. In short, the secret and mainspring of his influence over men lay in the power of spiritual realization which he possessed in an eminent degree.

But in the second place gratitude is due to him for his reconstructive work. This consisted mainly in the vivid, intuitive recognition of several religio-philosophic principles of the first importance, which his logical mind applied systematically to the whole body of Christian truth. In a word, he adopted a new basis for the Creed.

Neither the principles nor their re-discovery were his; but their emphasis and application to current religious difficulties was the work for which he will always be gratefully remembered. His insight, fervent faith, and clear mental perceptions united with a reconciling breadth of view, and large-hearted charity kept large numbers in the Church who would otherwise have been lost to her, and restored to many more a belief in Divine verities which the dissensions and puerilities of ecclesiastics and theologians had done their best to darken.

Since the *Modern Churchman* is dedicated to the same task, it may not be out of place to consider a few of the important

emphases for which the pulpit of St. John's, Westminster, became noted, and by which much of its success was achieved.

The Archdeacon put first things first. In fact there was to him but one truth in the Universe, a truth so essential and universal as to leave no room for aught else; within its all-comprehending embrace controversy was stilled, and dogmatic details were entirely obliterated. This was the absolute and all-explaining love of God which in his later years he re-iterated to the exclusion of every other point of view. His God-conception came into direct and ceaseless conflict with the conventional Deism which was the standpoint of the era when our Creeds were formed. In place of the "Mechanical Engineer external to His Universe," he substituted the conception of Divine Immanence, God the central evolving life of humanity and all that is, the absolute guarantee of ultimate restitution and perfection—God the All, Omnipresent Divine Love, which moral evil does but serve to accentuate by providing the contrast necessary to its recognition.

The solution of the problem of evil, and its reconciliation with this uncompromising postulate of the Allness of Divine Love was one of the Archdeacon's most characteristic endeavours. To say that he was not perfectly successful is only to state that the problem has yet to be solved; he himself was the last to minimise the agonising difficulties presented by the tears, the ignorance, the suffering, and the blinded self-will of mankind yet in the making. In spite, however, of all appearance to the contrary, his faith in the larger vision assured him that the discords and imperfections of the world are "but the normal conditions of the slow but ultimately irresistable process of evolution from within." Divine Immanence eased for him the agony of the problem.

> "The distinction between extra-cosmic Creation, and ultra-cosmic Immanence, is as wide as the poles.
>
> "Creation, the idea that a creative will, with no limits to its power, built up worlds and their contents, of which He became a spectator from without, interposes an immeasurable chasm between the Creator, and that which is created. The profound conception of Divine

> Immanence, on the other hand, sees God, not as an objective localized Person, but as a Supreme self-expressing Spirit everywhere, in everything, from whose Creative Mind all individual forms of existence are constantly emerging, and in which He finds self-realization. To the believer in the Allness of God, creation is not an action effected once for all, but a continuous process, the tireless self-utterance of the Divine Immanence. Every sprouting seed, every wheeling planet, every ordinary movement of the natural world, every noble aspiration of the human heart, is an expression of the energy of the ever-present, ever-active Soul of the Universe. Men are slow to grasp this conception of God as the vitally Real Presence everywhere, the generative and animating power in everything, because the strongest inherited conviction in the human mind is the idea of separateness from God, and, almost from the first, the teaching of the Christ was moulded by theologians and schoolmen to fit that conception."*

But the doctrine of Divine Immanence leads to still further revolution in the old-fashioned interpretation of our Creeds. The Incarnation becomes no longer miraculous in the sense that it is out of relation with the ordered workings of God in other departments of the world. On the contrary, it is seen, in the light of this principle, to be the most natural, because the most inevitable, event in human history. Jesus Christ is the perfect flowering of that Potency which is at the heart of all nature, and in an especial degree of man, nature's crown and completion. No miracle is required to explain the coming of Ideal Manhood to fruition, since for this the slow process of evolution has ever been steadily pressing onward. The miracle would rather be if such an event had *not* happened. Jesus is the specific embodiment of the Mystic Christ immanent in all men, therefore He and humanity are of the same genus. Hence He is the promise and guarantee of what the secret inworking of God is striving to make of man. Hidden, undeveloped, often thwarted, but ultimately irresistible, this life of God in man is a seed of omnipotence which cannot eventually suffer defeat; the logical *sequitur* of the Immanental doctrine, therefore, is Universalism in its most uncompromising form.

* *The Battle of the Lord*, p. 11.

This conception of God as an active working force within phenomena, slowly bringing all things to a predestined perfection is probably the line along which the great solution of the problem of evil may ultimately be found. It shows us "evolution as the process of life everywhere, and opposition to a contrary as the invariable law of its working." The conception has its metaphysical difficulties; it offers no hint as to *why* a process involving Time, Space, and material limitations should be the one, invariable mode of the manifestation of God in this Universe; it gives besides too great an objectivity to the categories of Time, Space, and Becoming.

The end it predicates, though implied in the nature of the Principle at work, still demands faith, hope, endurance, since it is far as yet from even the most distant realization. Still it forms a good working hypothesis, the basis of a legitimate optimism, and is capable of transforming the dry bones of the "Creation" theory into a new and vital conception of the relation of God to His world. The activism of Eucken, the vitalism of Bergson whose *élan vital* is only another aspect of the "Power that worketh in us," point to the value of the Immanental idea in other departments than Religion. Is it too much to assert that Archdeacon Wilberforce is the Henri Bergson of modern Christianity, though he is just as much, and just as little responsible as the French thinker for the conception which each in his different line has made so peculiarly his own?

CHARLOTTE E. WOODS.

THE MASS AND THE MASSES.*

Two perils confront the National Mission. One is that it may evaporate in mere vague sentiment, a temporary revival of pietism which will leave the mass of the nation untouched, and quickly fade away. The other peril is that the movement may be utilized to serve the designs of a narrow and not very scrupulous ecclesiastical clique.

Readers of the *Church Times* cannot be unaware of the existence of a desire on the part of some Anglo-Catholics to capture the movement, and to use it to further party ends. A great deal is being made of the alleged failure of the Anglican Church in the past, the dullness of her services, her inability to attract the masses. In certain extreme circles a supercilious disdain for "ordinary Anglicans" is now the fashion, exclusiveness is held to be the note of catholicity, and the really good Churchman is the man who can see little or no good in his own Church—"a white cliffs of Dover religion."

It is not the part of Liberal Churchmen to preach the gospel of self-complacency. But it may not be amiss to point out to our Anglo-Catholic friends that if the Church of England has failed, a portion at least of the responsibility for this failure lies upon them. Seasons of national penitence are not well employed when they are made the occasion of confessing only the sins and shortcomings of other people.

One proposal in connection with the National Mission which needs to be carefully watched is that for making Matins a mere Choir Office. A specious motion has been passed by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury to the effect that it is desirable that the Holy Communion should be the principal service on Sunday. No one can object to the terms

* "The masses must be won by the Mass." Concluding words of the leading article in the *Church Times* of May 19th, 1916.

of this resolution. Assuredly all Churchmen will agree that the Lord's Supper ought to be the central service of the day. But the intention of those who promoted this motion is undoubtedly to substitute the Eucharist for the customary Morning Prayer at eleven o'clock. Now taken in conjunction with the Anglo-Catholic opinion as to the desirability, not to say the obligation, of fasting Communion, this is no light matter. We know that in churches where this change has already been made that at mid-day celebrations no one except the priest, and possibly the three communicants demanded by the rubric, is expected to communicate. The laity are there at that hour to hear Mass, and to adore Christ in the sacramental elements. Now it is quite evident that it was the intention of the compilers of our Prayer-Book to discourage the mere "hearing of Mass." Their conception of the Holy Communion was rather that of a Feast in which all the worshippers should participate. This is not the time to discuss the English doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, but at least it may be said that if a change is to be made involving grave issues, it should be made deliberately, after due discussion, and in a time of calm.

The *Record* for June 1st contains an able and temperate statement of the case from the Evangelical point of view. It declares that:—

> "The proposal would prove most unacceptable to the great body of Evangelical Churchmen. . . . We repeat with all the emphasis that we can command that any attempt on the part of any section of the Church to snatch a party advantage from the National Mission will go a long way towards weakening the effect of the movement."

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* are aware that our attitude towards ritual controversies is not that of the section which the *Record* represents. There are Evangelicals who seem to wish to make the position of Anglo-Catholics in the Church of England impossible. We regard such a policy as neither just nor practicable. We recognise to the full the benefits which the Anglo-Catholic movement has conferred upon the Church of England. We desire for loyal Anglo-

Catholics the same liberty which we claim for ourselves and for the great Evangelical party. We believe that in the Church there must needs be diversity of operation, but the same spirit. But we also stand for the rights of the laity against clerical autocracy. We hold that parishioners should have a constitutional control over parochial services. It would be a grave scandal if changes should be rushed through at a time when the attention of the nation is distracted, and Churchmen who are absent from their homes in the service of their country should find on their return that alterations had been made in their parish churches which many of them would regard with grave disapproval. Surely it is only decent that there should be a truce in ecclesiastical as in secular politics. We do not want, at this time especially, to be distracted by polemical wrangles.

In any case the pressing Church reforms which ought to accompany the National Mission do not include "the Mass for the masses" at eleven o'clock on Sunday mornings as a substitute for "glorified Matins." By all means let every parish priest have one or more celebrations of Holy Communion every Sunday in his parish church, but in order to do that we would urge most emphatically that he has no right to abolish a service to which many regular Church attendants are deeply attached. Ardent Anglo-Catholic priests seem to regard the Mass as something to be celebrated quite irrespective of the desire of their parishioners to share in that service. A priest of this way of thinking said recently to a clerical neighbour:—

> "After the war broke out I put on a daily Mass in my church, but my people are so unresponsive, I have never had a communicant. Of course I should be quite glad if I had."

He had no doubt that he had done a right and wise thing in acting thus, and only felt a grievance with his parishioners because they tacitly declined to attend a service about which their clergyman had never consulted them, and whose mode of celebrating it they heartily disliked.

The drift away from Christianity has not been confined to any country or class. The expulsion of the religious orders

from France, the confiscation of church property in Portugal, and the steady advance of secularism in Spain and South America, testify to the weakening of organized religion in Roman Catholic countries, and should give pause to those who are inclined to seek national salvation in approximation to Roman methods and Roman ideals.

Religion in the period which we have left behind us had become too specialised, too departmental, too artificial; it had lost touch with life. The Church had allowed whole provinces of our complex modern existence to escape from her influence. She had failed to moralise the world of industry and commerce. She did not know how to voice that passion for social justice which, whatever may have been the faults and errors of individual social reformers, is one of the most hopeful and most Christian features of the age. She had not succeeded in appealing to the modern intellect, with its intense desire for truth at all costs.

Reform must begin at the House of God, but it is not by the introduction of mediaeval practices; it is not by emotional and sensational appeals that a way to the revival of national religion will be found. They know little of Englishmen who think that. There is no royal road to national regeneration, no backstairs into the Kingdom of Heaven. A comprehensive and laborious reconstruction of our social and religious life is needed, but that demands a change of heart and mind in Church and Nation, which shall bring us all into closer union with God, and so with all those who though they walk not with us, yet love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth.

SUMMER TIME: AN ANALOGY.

By the Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A., late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

The story of the adoption of daylight-saving in England shows our people—rulers and ruled alike—acting and thinking in a thoroughly typical way. It would not, in itself, be an appropriate subject for treatment in the pages of the *Modern Churchman*, but it becomes of interest when we notice that, from beginning to end, the discussion revealed the presence of that attitude and that temper of mind which, otherwise directed, are the cause of all our difficulties in the promotion of religious reforms. The proposal, first made several years ago, demanded our perception of a few simple facts, which, though they were within the comprehension of everybody, required some slight mental effort if they were to be clearly grasped. These facts were, first, that a part of our life is regulated by the sun; second, that a part is regulated by the clock; third, that during by far the greater part, it is quite impossible for most of us to detect, and is a matter of indifference even if we are told, whether clock and sun are in agreement. The kind of argument that was habitually directed against the scheme made it quite plain that these facts, simple as they seem, were not recognised. This paper is not intended as an argument in favour of the change,—it has become its own recommendation,—so we will not waste our readers' time by giving many examples of the general stupidity; one will suffice, and we will select the really amazing notion, frequently present in men's minds, that from May to next September our meals would all be announced before we were quite ready for them.

Even this year, the *Times* could publish a letter in which the proposal was described as one of the maddest ever brought before Parliament. Yet it is probably no exaggeration to say that, by the time the alteration had been in force for three days, its bitterest opponents had discovered that their opposition was due solely to ignorance and a lack of imagination. "They did

not know how simple it would all be,"—although it only needed a little effort to inform themselves; "they thought it meant something else,"—although they were repeatedly told that it didn't. And so it came about that while we might, with a little intelligence and the determination to use it, have had the merit of introducing the plan to a grateful world, we preferred, instead, to resist it to the last, with silly and childish objections;* and finally adopted it only after our enemies (whom we affect to despise) and some of our allies had made the experiment before us.

But the wretched tale is still incomplete. Even after summer time had been adopted in Germany and France, our rulers could only bring themselves (or was it that they could only induce the country?) to support the new bill by characterising it as a war measure. It was because it promised to save coal that people have allowed themselves the chance of seeing what it was like. It is, surely, humiliating to think that we might have reaped, for some years past, the benefits which everybody is now enthusiastically enjoying, and yet, in spite of the fact that almost every rational argument was in their favour, we declined them until it was urged that they involved a military advantage. Of course, those who have always been supporters of the scheme would rather it were introduced in this way than not at all, and they have always known that when once the objectors had experienced its results, there would be nothing more to fear from them; it is, however, one of the unfortunate consequences of the whole affair that no-one can now feel any respect for the intelligence of his countrymen on account of their decision.

Is it not the same want of imagination in our fellow-Christians that makes our position as liberal Churchmen so difficult, and our teaching so much disliked? Over and over again we are subjected to attacks which reveal nothing so clearly as that our opponents have not comprehended the nature of the position they are fighting against; and that is because they are not in the

* It is satisfactory to note that one or two arguments brought against the bill were sound, so far as they went, as, *e.g.*, the objection that harvesting work would have to begin later in the day owing to the later disappearance of the dew.

habit of analysing the complex processes which take place in their own minds. They mistake the psychological for the logical order, and regard the way in which they have privately arrived at a result as if it implied a necessary and universal sequence of proof. They are like the Chinese of whom "Elia" wrote, who, having become acquainted with roast pig through the burning of a house, assumed that without such conflagrations their taste could not be gratified. They have, for instance, accustomed themselves for so long to speak of the Virgin Birth as if it were somehow connected with the Divinity of Christ that they regard what is really a case of the association of ideas as though it involved logical dependence. The writer has no intention of implying that all liberal Churchmen reject the Virgin Birth; but he claims that no dogmatic presuppositions need prejudice the inquiry. And the contrary opinion seems to him to spring directly from that failure of imagination which makes it impossible to contemplate the separation of facts that a prolonged mental habit has combined.

Nothing would be gained by working out in further detail the application of what has been said; it will be an easy task for any reader who wishes to do so. In all these controversies, modern Churchmen have found that the most cogent arguments are quite ineffectual to break down the opposition which proceeds from the majority of the clergy. And it may be that their views must wait, as the daylight-saving bill has had to wait, until external events occur to re-inforce their case. Already something of the kind is happening, and, as in the other matter, it is the war which has brought it to pass. The stress and difficulty of religious work on the battlefield and in its neighbourhood have led to some considerable changes in ecclesiastical attitude and demands, for which we have hitherto pleaded in vain; no doubt, they will yet procure others. But it is worth repeating that the spectacle of a church, pledged to the worship and service of the God of Truth, yet yielding to the pressure of opportunity what it obstinately refuses to concede to reason and argument, is not one which will either win or merit the respect of future generations.

THE CONSCIENCE.

By the Rev. John Gamble, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods, Clifton.

Scruples of conscience have now been recognized by the Legislature as a valid reason why the most important public duties may be avoided,—why a man may refuse to have his children vaccinated, or take any part in military operations. Our own government is, I believe, the first to admit such a claim. We may well ask what the mysterious thing is whose behests are thus given precedence over the preservation of the public health, and the defeat of the common enemy.

The answer often given to this question seems ambiguous and misleading. Conscience is commonly identified with the moral sense, the knowledge of right and wrong. It is supposed to be a faculty like the sense of beauty or the sense of truth. Just as we are able to distinguish between beauty and ugliness, or between truth and falsehood, so we can distinguish between right and wrong, and the part of our nature which we use in making this last distinction we call the conscience.

This explanation, seems, however, to claim for the conscience more than properly belongs to it, and to confound two operations which should be kept distinct. One of these is the knowledge of what is right, and what is wrong. The other is the prompting to do the one, and abstain from the other, when we are clear about what they are. Surely it is only with the last of these the conscience, as the word is commonly used, is concerned.

The conscience does not teach us what is right and what is wrong. It only urges us with monotonous persistence to follow the pathway we have marked as the right one. We do not

begin to speak of the conscience until we are obliged to act. We may then say: "My conscience urges me to take a certain course, or forbids me to take it. If I act in a particular way I seem to wound my moral sensibility."

Thus the work of conscience only begins when we have settled with ourselves, at any given moment, what is right, and what, consequently, it behoves us to do. Then, for the first time, its voice begins to speak. It says: "This thing which you judge to be right you must, at all costs, do. This which you judge to be wrong you must, at all costs, avoid."

But how are we to determine what is right and what is wrong? It is at this point difficulty begins. For we have only our minds, guided, as we believe them to be, by the Spirit of Truth, to teach us. We have to examine, to think, to pray. And however earnest we are, we may make mistakes, and go astray. We are no more infallible in our moral judgments than we are in other things. We often acquiesce in actions from which we ought to shrink, and decline duties which we ought to accept.

The instances of such mistaken judgments in past times are so well-known that the barest allusion will be sufficient to recall them. Men once tortured and even burned defenceless women through the groundless belief in witchcraft. They had no doubt they were doing right, although they were really in grievous error. They put prisoners to the torture in order to force them to make confessions because they did not realize that confessions wrung from men in agony were likely to be false. They made large fortunes by buying and selling slaves, and the most religious men joined without any misgiving in this inhuman traffic.

Again, the upper and middle classes of English society in the 18th century, accepted their own prosperity and the poverty of large numbers of their immediate neighbours, with what appears to us a too easy complacency. It never occurred to them to suppose that their wealth needed any justification, or imposed any public obligations upon them towards the wretched and

the unfortunate. They took it for granted that, just as there were tall people in the world and short people, so there must be affluent and indigent people, and that it belonged to the general fitness of things that they should be among the affluent.

History abounds in such evidences of the fallibility of men's moral judgments. And invariably we see the conscience waiting upon the judgment, and merely enforcing what the judgment has already decided.

Thus before a man listens to the voice of his conscience he should consider whether he has done his utmost to learn what he really ought to do. He has no infallible oracle seated within his breast from whose decisions there can be no further appeal. He may be taking a view of his duty which, if he were better informed, he would not take. Then the voice of conscience will mislead him. If the judgment is in error, the conscience will be in error too. To think that we have within us an oracle called conscience whose authority supersedes that of the reason, and whose promptings must be forthwith obeyed, is to set up an idol in our hearts, and then to fall down and worship it. For there is no such oracle. If there were there would be as many oracles as there are individuals, and thus an incessant conflict of authorities all presumably infallible. Conscience follows, and does not precede the knowledge of right and wrong. As this knowledge widens, the promptings of the conscience vary just as the action of a barometer does when it is lifted up to a greater height.

Associations are, however, very tenacious, and the eye may take some time before it accustoms itself to the increase of light. Our reluctance to a particular action may remain long after we have come to regard the action as lawful or praiseworthy. Such reluctance should not be allowed to overrule the mind's deliberate judgment.

In one of the Gospel sayings a situation is brought before us where it becomes a duty to silence the scruples of conscience. The Saviour says: "if a man hate not father, and mother, and wife, and children, he is not worthy to be my disciple." No

one could hate those nearest and dearest to him, or could act as if he did hate them, disregarding their wishes, and turning a deaf ear to their pleadings without the keenest self-reproach. If, however, he decides that the claim of Christ is stronger than the claims of kindred, he is bound to act as if he hated those whom he really loves.

The situation thus contemplated seems very similar to that which the progress of the war has brought about here in England. We cannot accept the statement that the taking of human life in war is only repugnant to a small group of persons within the nation whose consciences are peculiarly sensitive. It is repugnant, I believe, to us all, at least to all who are in the position of civilians. A soldier by profession has accepted the necessity once for all as incidental to the calling which he has deliberately adopted. Yet even a professional soldier would shrink from taking the life of an unsuspecting enemy did he meet him away from the actual scene of battle. Such a duty can never be otherwise than repulsive to one who has time to contemplate it. No doubt, in the heat of conflict, it is no more than a move in the fierce game of war.

Such is the situation of the great majority of our countrymen at this moment. We do not, as a nation, love war. It would be more true to say that we hate it. Yet hating it as we do, we are as much menaced by its perils and bound by its obligations as if we regarded it as the Divinely-appointed test of a nation's strength. Thus we have no alternative but to silence the scruples of conscience in obedience to the deliberate judgments of our minds, as the disciples of Christ did who broke up their family peace in response to His urgent call.

The situation is one more reminder that duty is often by no means as simple as it is commonly represented. Commonly the choice does not lie between what is plainly and undeniably right on the one side, and what is as plainly wrong on the other. The threads of good and evil are too subtly interwoven to be separable by the most delicate of instruments. Strong reasons may generally be urged for each of the two

opposing courses. For the most part we must be content with actions to which we see serious objections, and which cause us many misgivings.

It is this frequent complexity of duty which has given rise to the expression "a morbid conscience." It is not that the conscience can be too sensitive. It is that some people fail to see their duty in its full amplitude, or in its true proportions. They do not see life truly or "see it whole." The important things are obscured by others which are less important. Such people need to live on terms of greater trust and affection with God. They need to remember that what He asks for is the heart honestly given. Each man must do his work in the world, and he will not do it by doubts and scruples.

Prolonged indifference to what is right and what is wrong produces in the end what is called a callous conscience. If a man gets into the habit of thinking exclusively of what will profit or "pay" him individually his moral sensitiveness will become at last blunted, and he will cease to believe that there is any such thing as disinterested action. The great company of saints and heroes will melt away into the mists of fairyland, and he will be shut up within the narrow and sordid world which he has created for himself.

This is a catastrophe of which we must all stand in dread. Hence we cherish the memory of those who in other days have withstood the opinion of their contemporaries and have been willing to suffer for conscience' sake. They inspirit us, however, precisely because they have been ready to bear the full consequences of their refusal, and have accepted the penalties which they knew they had incurred.

The admission of conscientious objections as a valid reason for evading public obligations can only be justified on the ground of temporary political expediency. It is hard to see any other ground on which it can be seriously defended. Most laws touch the moral sense at some points. If we are to be at liberty to disregard those which seem to us morally objectionable the whole fabric of law runs the risk of being undermined.

Many complaints have been made as to the unfair treatment conscientious objectors have met with from the tribunals before which they appeared. The truth is that these tribunals are called upon to perform an impossible task. They are asked to decide not who is fit and who is unfit for military service, but how far a man's reluctance to undertake such service will disqualify him from performing it. Such a question can only be properly decided by actual trial. He may come to think very differently of military duty when he makes actual experience of it. It may be that his pacifist temper will still assert itself and make him useless as an active combatant. But even if this be so, work can be found for him elsewhere. His own disclination is surely not a legitimate or measurable reason why he should be excluded from the scope of the law.

To sum up then. We are intended under all cases to subordinate the conscience to the judgment. Our first duty is to learn what is right, what, when all things are considered, we ought to do. In endeavouring to form a sound judgment upon this we may indeed go astray, for we have no infallible oracles either outside or within us to shield us from mistakes. If we find ourselves at variance with the general opinion, and especially if this opinion be expressed in law, the strong probability is that the general conscience is right and our own wrong. If, however, conscience remains insistent, we must disobey the law and accept the penalties of disobedience whatever they be. If we really desire to learn the Divine Will, and are prepared to follow it although it be to our own hindrance, we may have a good conscience towards God, not because we have any immunity from mistakes, but because we rely upon His forgiveness and believe that He will bring us back into the right way, even when we do wander from it misled by the sophistries of the mind or the passionate impulses of the heart.

THE VALLEY OF DRY BONES.

By a Layman.

How many clergy really know what is demanded of them by the laity they are supposed to serve? We might expand the question, and ask: How many have any knowledge of the opinions entertained of them by the great mass of Englishmen, educated and uneducated? They are momentous questions, for the success or failure of the Church as a living force in the national life is largely dependent on the answer. But whatever be the demands and opinions, and however anxious individual clergymen may be to hear them, there are great difficulties in the way. How shall the voices of ordinary men and women, speaking often in rude and contemptuous terms, be heard in those clerical councils where the harsh and painful is seldom introduced without modification! Absorbed in the daily somewhat mechanical round of their profession, many of the clergy hear no criticism but that of their fellows. The voice of public opinion comes to them through clerical channels, or is so modified by those laymen who attend their councils, and are careful of their feelings, that the effect is lost, and the original message altered past recognition. There is a formality and a slow dignity in these proceedings which make it impossible for the alarm to be sounded.

If a clerical brother familiar with the facts of life, and with an inherent tendency to call things by their right names, takes part in the discussion the others will wince under statements that he must make, and feign to regard him as delighting in unsavoury subjects. At all costs nothing must be said or done which may suggest to the assembled gentlemen that they do not know their own business, and that there are things more important calling for their attention than the doubtful meaning of certain phrases in the epistles, and the correct ceremonial of public worship.

We are tempted to ask: For what does the nation maintain this numerous body of men? Is it that they may satisfy themselves upon the plans of Omnipotence, and explain to each other in ceaseless debate the precise form and value of the revelation made by God of Himself in Christ? Important and absorbing questions no doubt, and matters upon which all religiously minded persons must think. But we do not know that the people of this country consider it necessary to maintain a body of trained enquirers on metaphysical subtleties, and we hardly believe that it is here that we should look for the title deeds of the Church. It may be argued that their duty is to sound the praises of the Maker of all, and to administer the Sacraments which authority has established. Authority established other Sacraments which are now swept away, and a harsh Government stifled the voices of an army of praisers not so many centuries ago. We are now inclined to question the value of most institutions, and especially those which cost much money. The Church of England assuredly is very costly, and we have the right to ask if she is worth the expense.

We have some idea as to the origin of the Christian Church, and also we think that we know something of those who won her first victories. Therefore we must compare their aims and ideals with those of their successors, and as we have agreed to reverence the founders we shall be content with the modern Church if there has been no great change in her conception of her duties. But it appears that the ideal of service has somehow been lost sight of, yet it is as servants that the clergy stand or fall. "I am among you as He that serveth," said their Master, and from His society no person, however humble in station, or unworthy in character, was ever excluded. Now to say that this ideal has been lost sight of is to bring a very serious charge, and one that in the face of much unselfish service rendered by many good men it may appear presumptuous to make. Yet there can be no doubt that modern clergymen regard their position from a very different standpoint from that of those who first spread the faith.

The clergy to-day occupy a certain social position, are accustomed to assert the class distinctions which are recognised by other men of their birth and education, and consider their right to houses and incomes inalienable, and in no way dependent on their usefulness. The higher ranks have received much when all allowances are made, and the nation will want to know what they give in return, and at no time with better cause than to-day. The message of the Church, if she is to fulfil her Master's will, is not primarily to those who already support her by large contributions or zealous attention to her daily offices, but to the far larger number who although indifferent to dogmas and ordinances are yet under the necessity of living their lives. To these she has a great though perhaps unrealised responsibility, so it seems to those who attempt to judge her by her pretentions. The clergy are not unconscious of their failure, indeed they constantly bemoan the widespread indifference to religion, and cast about for means to remedy this condition. But they are extremely sensitive to criticism, and are apt to demand that anyone who reflects upon the condition of their order shall be a person learned in their own peculiar subjects, with degrees and distinctions from Universities saturated with their influence; in fact that he shall have a name which shall be recognised not only by the Bishop in his Palace, but also by the country parson shocked at the critic's temerity. However though they may wish it, they cannot long have it so; they are not yet forced to take notice of the ignorant multitude, but they soon will be, and we shall pity their consternation.

Would that those who watch for our souls could hear the comments made upon their activities whenever a number of young men meet together and consider such a subject worthy of their attention! In making this observation we have in mind the outbreak of clerical activity which has taken place during the progress of the war, and we are thinking chiefly of those who are nominally members of the English Church, and are as likely material as she has to work upon. Take the case of the

new Armies and the Junior Officers appointed to them. Of these the writer knows many, and perhaps is better qualified to speak of their opinions than are their clerical acquaintances before whom they never use their accustomed vocabulary. He finds that although in many cases the chaplains at the front are respected, and their services admired, the Church of England in England which confronts men on their return home is treated as just the same incomprehensible pile of lumber as they felt it to be before they went out. At what point does she touch their lives? What has she to offer them? Of course there are her peculiar attractions, and surely they should value them. We know of large numbers of men who will go to hear a certain very popular prelate, the writer has done so more than once, but whereas the good Bishop believes and says he believes that his words produce a great and lasting change, those concerned are too often quite unconscious of the miracle. He recounts the promising remarks made to him by those who know how to address Bishops, and although no doubt the speakers really feel what they say, one is painfully conscious of the facility with which such remarks are made, and fancies oneself giving utterance to much the same reflections, yet with considerable mental reservations. Popular preachers are continually treating us to great assumptions, for which they would be hard put to it to give their authority. A greater readiness to confess that there is a problem in the universe not all to be summed up by a belief in the beneficence of God, and the sinfulness of man, would make their hearers more disposed to trust them as guides.

The clergy neglect the many suggestions which might come to them through indifferent or hostile channels, because they disapprove of the form in which these suggestions are conveyed. They must know that the majority of men transgress the commandments, but unless the pointed ideas of these same men are so presented as to leave unthreatened the clerical standards of morality, the clergy will not listen but turn away in disgust. The terrible tendency to form a caste is seen most

clearly in this matter. We would not ask the clergy to surrender deep convictions, but we do ask why it is that many of their fellow-men are unable to think likewise. Now we, who are the people concerned, are conscious that in many cases the clergy are men the purity of whose lives must command respect, and who, at least, set a high standard in the avoidance of sins of commission. They have also abundantly proved their right to be heard on a multitude of intellectual questions. We know of many who are great scholars and fine teachers. But have we not the right to ask for something more? Englishmen are not satisfied that scholarship and the administration of the Sacraments are their only, or even their chief, functions. It is felt that, in a terribly difficult and tragic world, they should take a part in helping men to live, and if they believe in their Master's message, they should deliver His rules of conduct in no uncertain fashion.

To take an example—it has been repeatedly urged in the secular Press that some reasonable instruction and counsel on sexual matters should be given to young men and women in this country. What has the Church done in the matter? Little enough, and that to the knowledge of the most ordinary layman. She professes to feel a responsibility for the lives led by her children, but is so wrapt in contemplation of the heavenly mysteries as to forget that men have bodies, and with them strong and active desires. The writer has heard most of the prominent preachers of the English Church, and usually in sermons specially preached before those who have life ahead of them. With two exceptions there was no attempt made to deal with problems vital in the experience of almost everyone of their hearers. Of the two exceptions, one was the Bishop of Oxford, who on a special occasion made an attempt to carry out a task plainly distasteful to himself. The other, a young man, who electrified a cathedral congregation by telling them things never heard of before in such a place. Men from the front spoke of the effort with admiration as a proof of courage which they little expected, and had never experienced from

their chaplains out there. This is no small omission, but the clergy will not realise it. Who is to tell the highly accomplished persons holding stalls in our cathedrals, and devoting their lives to research, that unless they and their brethren can produce good reasons to the contrary, there are thousands of men fighting England's battles to-day, who will inevitably gratify the natural demands of the flesh. The best minds of the Church seems to devote themselves to discussions of dogma and to a championship of the cause of modern research. They leave Christian ethics severely alone. The Fratricelli, the Celestinians, and the Flagellants of the middle ages were no doubt deluded, and we would not wish to follow their practices to-day. But the Church needs something of their enthusiasm, and could afford to exchange for it the leisurely and elaborately organised redemptive machinery of our own times.

Very many priests, the trials and temptations of their owu youth long forgotten, have no real conception of how the ordinary man lives, or of what he says or thinks. Their minds have become permeated by the pietistic exercises of long years of self-suppression. That which is outside their experience they condemn, and will not learn from those whose own transgressions have given them a fuller knowledge of the subject. The circulation of the paper called *John Bull* is said to be somewhere near two millions. In nearly every issue there is an attack (often very unjust) on some clergyman whose conduct is represented to have been petty and uncharitable. Its rough system of justice for both sexes, and fair play all round, wins the enthusiastic support of its multitudes of readers. Is there nothing to be learnt from this? We have the plain fact that what it provides is eagerly sought for by those of whom the Church is in search, while her own message is passed by with indifference, if not with hostility. Yet few are the clergy who will buy this paper to see what it is that attracts. They prefer to condemn it as unworthy of a Christian nation.

When the clergy make a special effort the results are often curious. Not long ago a Fellow of an Oxford College, well-known throughout the country as a speaker and preacher, wrote a number of letters to our leading daily paper dealing with the spiritual aspects of the war as they presented themselves to him. Many of his clerical brethren appeared to think that the call had gone forth, and that there was nothing now for his countrymen to do but obey. Yet there was nothing in these letters which would have won the attention of the ordinary careless hard swearing mortal for a moment. Had the writer heard the comments made upon his amiable generalities by members of his own college serving in the forces, and by others whom he supposed to be specially affected, his confidence in the power of his message might have been rudely shaken. That these and many other pronouncements may be of value in themselves, and afford food for thought to those who make a hobby of such reading, is not denied. Only it is important that those who write them should have a correct idea of the reception they meet with, and not form the opinion that they are received by men at the front with the same interest that would be shown if *John Bull* published a double number. The young clergy whose ministerial work lies in the slums and in the great centres of population, do undoubtedly learn much of the class they are brought into contact with. But those who occupy higher positions upon the social ladder clothe themselves in a defensive armour which usually proves to be impenetrable when attacked by the darts carefully tempered in a theological college. If it be true that the clergy of all schools of thought fail sufficiently to emphasise that part of their message which supplies rules for living, there is still a charge to be brought against them in those very matters on which they do bestow much attention. Men seek some clear and definite teaching as to the relations of God and man, and they wish to know, at least those do who feel any curiosity at all about such subjects, how far the antique formulas of the National Church represent her views of the Christian revelation in the light of to-day.

Hopeless demand! Within her communion there are almost as many opinions as there are teachers. And each and all, if they avoid some glaring statement, the expression of which uncensured would overthrow her *raison d'être*, are allowed by our most tolerant mother to confuse and baffle the simple aspirant to a workable faith. It may be doubted if a society in such a condition can long maintain herself in the modern world. Christianity was originally not a thing which could be taken easily, men were able to ignore it and dismiss the revolutionary religion as vain and impossible, but those who subscribed to a faith from which no worldly advantages were to be gained, had little chance of taking their responsibilities easily. But now not only are there the most glaring discrepancies between the system preached and the practice followed, but even those who are undoubtedly good men are content that it should be so, and are not even moved to a smile by their own inconsistencies. The truth appears to be that Christianity has already succumbed to the world. We are so constantly warned not to press this and that awkward passage of Scripture that in the end we find official Christianity to be quite another thing from that which the whole tenor of the Gospels led us to suppose. In our ignorance we ask what was the need of such a religion? It seems to leave things much as they would be if human nature unguided worked out its own will in our sorrowful world. But the clergy will have to reckon with all this. We already badly want to know the why and the wherefore, and not much longer will they be able to ignore our enquiries, because we do not come up to their standard of scholarship or are unfit to compete with them in learned controversy. We are told to fix our eyes upon Christianity, but they are giving us dangerous advice. We shall do so, and let them beware of the examination. As the sixteenth century reformers went back from the traditions of the Church to the original records, so shall we do, and we shall boldly declare that which we find there. It is the old cry of "Physician heal thyself." They have told us truly that

we have sinned, but are they spotless? If we have wandered far, have they held closely to the rules laid down by Christ for His servants? They may tell us that we are mistaken, and that to discuss these questions it is necessary to have a close acquaintance with the history of exegesis. But our answer will be that they have so closely examined the Gospel message as to have come to the conclusion that it is impossible and will not work. The nation maintains them as priests of Christianity, if Christianity has ceased to apply to the modern world, how and on what grounds can they continue to form a part of it?

It may be urged that there is no evidence to support the statement that the clergy are out of touch with the lives of the people, and have failed to afford any real help at a time of greatest need. It is not a matter in which detailed evidence can be produced. If we are mistaken the responsibility for reckless assertion is on our heads, and the clergy will have an opportunity of practising the essentially Christian virtue of patient endurance when baselessly accused. But because we have a strong sentimental attachment to the English Church, we are anxious that she should not fail for lack of knowledge—self-knowledge. The open hostility of her declared enemies is more easily met than the contemptuous indifference of her one-time friends.

R.E.

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

VI.—His Church.

The Church has been the subject of more controversies among Christians than perhaps any other point on which they have been divided. Those controversies show no sign of coming to an end. On the contrary they are to-day almost, if not quite, as acute as they have ever been. There is no subject connected with the practice of their religion about which there is less common agreement among Christian people than there is about the nature of the Church. As soon as you attempt to define it, every term in that definition will prove the starting-point for a fresh controversy. From this somewhat sinister fact, as it appears to be, we may draw two conclusions. It points in the first place to the real, almost vital, importance of the subject. Men do not dispute so incessantly except about matters which they consider of great moment. However much they may differ, all, or almost all, Christians are agreed that the idea of a Church is so deeply rooted in Christianity that it must occupy a large place in our thoughts. We cannot get rid of those distressing controversies by cutting that word, with all that it means, out of our conception of the Christian life. It stands for a great reality. Christianity is essentially the religion of a corporate life. It is based not only on a common faith but on a common fellowship. It has always sought its full expression in some form of brotherhood between men. And those ideas of fellowship, brotherhood, corporate life, are quite fundamental. A merely individual Christianity would be an impossible conception. The relation of men to one another is as vital as their relation to God or their discipleship of Christ. The idea of a community, of a society bound together by the closest ties, of one body animated by one Spirit, or, in other words, of a Church, is a necessary consequence of the Christian faith. When a man becomes a

Christian, and so long as he remains a Christian, he finds himself a member of such a community. And the second conclusion is this;—that this idea of the Church, which is seen to be so important, has proved itself to be the most dangerous, the most easily preverted, the most liable to misuse. The very thing which was intended to preserve and express the idea of fellowship and brotherhood, has in history proved the greatest hindrance to the actual realisation of those ideas in life. Every separate group of Christians has claimed an exclusive validity for its conception of what this community ought to be. They have cut themselves off, more or less rigidly, from all who do not accept their own definition. Just in proportion as their own view of the Church has been clear and definite, they have unchurched others who do not accept the conditions of membership which they consider essential. The Church has been narrowed down to the dimensions of a sect. The unity which ought to exist among all true disciples of the Master has been broken up into as many fragments as there are varying conceptions of what the Church of Christ should be. The whole tragedy of Church history is written in these words.

Now it is impossible for anyone who calls himself a Churchman—even a modern Churchman—to ignore this difficulty. He cannot refuse to answer the question what he means by the Church. He is bound to meet that demand or else to give up the name of Churchman altogether. Yet the modern Churchman cannot give it the same simple and easy answer that is open to others. He is bound to take into account the witness of the New Testament, the experience of history and the contemporary facts of Christian life. If we go back to the Gospels we find but little mention of the Church. The word itself only occurs on three occasions in the Gospels. We are told sometimes that Jesus came into the world to found a Church, but the Gospels themselves—the only authentic records which we possess of His life and teaching—afford very little justification for such a statement. That He drew His

disciples together into a simple community, that they shared a common life with Him, and that He exhorted them to live together in love after He was gone, is certain, but it is equally certain that He did not lay down for them any definite rules of organisation. In the Epistles and Acts of the Apostles we naturally read much more about the Church. We follow the development of the Christian societies in their earliest stages. We recognise the first efforts that were made at organisation, the beginnings of a regular ministry and the adoption of simple rules of discipline. But at this stage the organisation is fluid and adaptable. It had not become rigid and formal. It is always secondary and in the background. What is primary is still the ideas of common fellowship, and the intangible bonds of brotherhood and love. As history goes on the emphasis is shifted. The Church becomes more and more a visible society, distinct and definite, with its faith, its ministry, its discipline clearly fixed. It claims to exercise an external authority over its members. It imposes tests of belief and practice, and the acceptance of these tests is more and more urgently demanded. A definite rule of faith, an apostolic succession and an ordered ministry, and obedience to certain disciplinary rules, become the external marks of the Church. Part of this development was wholesome and necessary, part of it wholly mischievous. For it is impossible to lay the emphasis strongly on these things without withdrawing it to some extent from others. Love, brotherhood, fellowship, which had been the only tests in the earlier days, become now of secondary importance, and strict conformity to an ecclesiastical system takes their place. The first have been put last and the last first. It is this tendency which has resulted in the divided state of Christendom to-day.

Now, the modern Churchman when he reads this history, will not be deaf to the warnings which are so clearly written there. He will learn to attach far less importance to matters of outward organisation than to the presence of a true spirit of brotherhood and fellowship among believers. He will look

back to the days when these were the things that mattered most, and outward forms had not been set up in their place. He will never be able to believe that any single rule of organisation, however venerable—such, for instance, as apostolic succession or the maintenance of episcopacy,—is really essential to the existence of the Church. To whatever branch of the Christian Church he may belong—and there are modern Churchmen in all Churches,—he will never be a "good Churchman" in the sense in which those words are ordinarily understood, because he cannot attribute to the particular rules of his own Church an absolute and exclusive validity. It will be impossible for him to believe that Christian unity will ever come through one particular branch of the Church in time absorbing all the others or through the whole of Christendom agreeing to accept one form of organisation, but rather he will look for it through the growth among all the Churches of a larger sympathy with one another, of a deeper longing for unity, and a wider sense of brotherhood. And he will hail as the most promising sign, not the rigid maintenance of ancient standards, but rather the willingness of men to break through the barriers that divide them at present. His Church will be found wherever there is Christian brotherhood and fellowship and love, wherever two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ.

It is sometimes said that the modern Churchman—if this is what he really believes—has no right to the name of Churchman at all. The Bishop of Oxford has recently asked the question: "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" And he answers it in effect by saying that it is only worth preserving if it can be made more definite in its particular standpoint, if it can revive its discipline and regain the power to exclude from its fellowship those who do not conform exactly to its standards. The Church would be worth preserving if it could recover the old weapons of persecution and make effective use of the old instruments of torture. That kind of Churchmanship, though it may call itself "broadly Catholic," is the most

narrowly sectarian of all. It is the greatest danger that threatens the Church of England to-day. It has no message for the future except a re-affirmation of the dogmas of the past. It has no contribution to make to a re-united Christendom, except by trying to defend barriers which are already giving way. To resist that tendency may be the highest service that a modern Churchman can render to the Church to-day, and if he has no other claim to call himself a Churchman than that, he may be content.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IN TERMS OF SPACE.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I was very glad to see your little note in the April number on the Immanence *versus* the Transcendence of God.

As you say what matters is not the *mode* of God's existence but His *nature* and His relation to our spirits.

Do you not think that the *spatial* idea that people so naturally have of God and heaven as *above* us may come from the notion of antagonism between the "natural" and the "spiritual," so that the primitive, fundamental "natural" force—gravitation—must be resisted and overcome by spirit?

We must get away from our roots and so "upward," as a plant does.

It seems evident to me that the truth (apart from figurative expression) lies in not insisting on spatial concepts at all. We know that God is "with" man.

J.A.C.

The College Club, 40, Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, U.S.A.

SIR,

In the correspondence on "Is the Bible Theocentric?" there occur these remarks—"We cannot help thinking in terms of space"—"Space exists for us and not for God"—"When we speak of God as transcendent or immanent we are speaking of Him in terms of space." Do we all mean the same thing by the word space? I turn to a dictionary and I find that space is mere extension. Yet extension has no limit, it is infinite, so that to speak of God in terms of space may mean to speak of Him in terms of infinity, and is not altogether inappropriate.

But modern science and modern thought have given to space quite a new significance. No space that comes within our knowledge is mere space, empty space, for all space known to us is occupied by ether. To the modern scientist space is equivalent to ether, a volume of space is a volume of ether. Then to speak of God in terms of space is to speak of the Creator in terms of Creation. For what is ether? Modern science tells us that it is the real

substance—the raw material so to speak—of the material universe, that it contains the potentialities of suns and planets and of all matter inorganic and organic, that it is full of creative energy, that it is infinite, universal, transcendent and yet essentially immanent in all matter.

It has not yet been revealed to man—it is a revelation that many devoutly long for—What is the relation of the ether of space to life, to reason, to spirit and to God? Some scientists are expressing their belief that the etheric universe has a rational and a spiritual basis. It seems to be being revealed to us at the present time that all existence is a unity, that there is no real break between the supernatural and the natural, that the transcendent is immanent in and expresses itself in all lower planes of existence. In the light of this revelation it is not altogether inappropriate to speak of God and of divine and spiritual realities in terms of space.

49, *Clarendon Road*, CLEMENT POYNDER.
Redland, Bristol.

[The late Lord Salisbury, addressing the British Association some years ago, stated that all the scientific world *knew* of ether is that it vibrates. Does it *know* any more now? Our knowledge of the properties of ether is so slight that it hardly warrants our speaking of God in terms of ether. Auguste Sabatier deplored that the conception of God as the Universal Spirit gave to the modern popular mind the impression that He is a very finely diffused gas permeating all space. The Nicence controversy, which defined God in terms of substance, *ousia*—is of course open to a similar objection, *i.e.*, it is materialistic. S. T. Coleridge realised the dangers of the spatial concept, and urged in his day that it was better to substitute for the popular *dictum*, "God is everywhere," the less dangerous but more morally valuable reflection: "Everywhere that I am, I am in the presence of God."

A valuable little book, by J. Haldane, F.R.S., entitled *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, urges that man is best defined not in mechanical or chemical or physical or biological, but in psychological terms—that is to say in terms of the highest category with which we are acquainted. The same principle ought to be followed in thinking and speaking of God. When Israel's prophets spoke of Jehovah as *the living God*, they meant that he was a *personal* God. We ought always to try and think of Him as possessing in an infinite degree those powers which constitute the essence and glory of human personality. Whether He be multi-personal or supra-personal we cannot know now. It must suffice for us that He is supremely personal, and as such we can hold communion with Him. The danger of the spatial or aetheric conception of God is that it endangers our belief in His Personality. The Christian doctrine of the Trinity understood in the modern way presents the Divine Nature as Transcendent, Immanent and Incarnate, and in that respect has many advantages over Pantheistic and Deistic and Dualistic efforts at re-statement.—ED. *M.C.*]

CANON RASHDALL ON CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Dr. Rashdall has an easy task in disposing of his first three classes of recusants against military service,—the literalists, the intuitionists, and those who have a low and unworthy idea of human good. He is not so successful

in his treatment of the more typical conscientious objector, who belongs very often both to class 4 (those who interpret history otherwise than the late Canon Danks), and to class 5 (those who, like Peter and John in Acts iv. 19, refuse to do what they think wrong at the bidding of a magistrate).

Dr. Rashdall is mistaken in supposing that his fourth class base their views on "ignorance of fact." They are aware that Christianity and Islam have extended and defended their frontiers by force of arms; and also that Buddhism has spread its influence enormously without the use of any material force. But they hold (*a*) that Christianity debases itself, and wins only the spectre of victory, when it makes its way by fire and sword; (*b*) that the origin of Christianity exhibits a capital example of the better and more powerful method, the paradox of triumphant meekness.

In criticising class 5, Canon Rashdall sets up a very high doctrine of "the State,"—so high, indeed, that after applying it to discredit the conscientious objector he feels constrained to modify it; the subordination of private judgment to State authority "may be carried too far." Such abstract doctrines have an academic use, but are not convenient rules of action in actual politics. If we keep to the concrete we have to confess that *this* State is believed to be democratic; that three years ago it was avowedly and proudly voluntarist; that its changes in policy are constitutionally initiated by a general election; that the exigences of war, and the persistent agitation of a powerful group of newspapers, swayed by one man, have led to an extreme change of policy, without any general election. If the conscientious objector, as a voluntarist, declares that he is really the champion of "the State" against an unconstitutional usurpation, he certainly has a case, a case founded on the ancient and hitherto accepted constitutional doctrine of this particular state, not, like that of Canon Rashdall, on a major premiss concerning "the State" universal, which is after all, it seems, only an I-proposition, not a Universal affirmative.

Modern Churchmen ought to be on their guard against an error into which the Bishop of Oxford seems (not in this field) to have fallen; that of failing to distinguish between (1) reasons good for the settling of our private convictions, and (2) reasons good for the setting up of a rule, to be enforced coercively.

May I say in conclusion that though I do not accept the attitude of the conscientious objector, I am convinced, by the reports of tribunal-proceedings, that the harshness with which they are being treated is, in a very large degree, the outcome of mere party passion, and of nothing that deserves a more respectable name.

E. W. Lummis.

Lea Cross, Shrewsbury.

A REPLY BY CANON RASHDALL.

Sir, *To the Editor of* The Modern Churchman.

The difference between Mr. Lummis and myself turns mainly, I should infer from his letter, upon a different reading of history, and therefore I do not think any useful purpose would be served by my replying in detail to his arguments unless I were prepared to write a long and elaborate article, for

which you would perhaps have no room, but I should like to make one or two remarks upon his position.

(1) I do take a high view of "the State," *i.e.*, all States. All history and all experience of life seem to me to show that a State which is to survive must be able to count, under all ordinary circumstances, upon the absolute and unlimited obedience of all its citizens and in particular upon their willingness to defend it against external enemies.

(2) I do not deny that there may be exceptions to this rule, though the cases in which, on account of his private opinion as to the merits of a particular war, a subject is justified in refusing to obey a law which calls upon him to serve his country, are so rare that I should prefer not to venture upon an illustration. I can only say that—to me and the vast majority of Englishmen—it is clear that this is not such an exception. The British State (including the Empire as a whole) seems to me to be one which it is of the highest importance to humanity to preserve, and we have been assured by the competent authorities that there is no way of preserving it but this. Religions have certainly been spread by meekness, but I know of no instance in which a State has successfully repelled armed attack on a large scale by an attitude of "meekness," if by that attitude is meant non-resistance or permission to individual citizens to adopt such an attitude. It is entirely misleading to suggest, as Mr. Lummis does, that I am in favour of extending Christianity "by fire and sword," but surely I am not wrong in suggesting that, if Christians had been exterminated or compulsorily converted by Mahommedanism, there would be no Christianity (or civilization or political liberty) now. I, for one, believe that this would have been a misfortune to the world, and the wars which prevented it were justified. These wars were essentially defensive wars.

(3) Mr. Lummis appeals to the actual British Constitution. He declares that "this State is believed to be democratic." If Democracy means that, when the enemy are at our gates, Parliament is precluded from adopting whatever means it believes it to be necessary for the defence of the realm without a general election, the assertion seems to me wholly unfounded. A constitution which contained such a provision would place the State in a position of extreme insecurity, and would eminently need changing. Nor could anything be more undemocratic than to hold a general election when a large proportion of the manhood of the country was absent on military service.

(4) I was not concerned with the question of the behaviour of individual tribunals or of individual conscientious objectors, but with a question of principle. I do not deny that some tribunals have treated some objectors harshly and discourteously, though I have been more impressed with the lamentable state of mental confusion exhibited by some objectors, and the sheer selfishness of others. A better machinery could doubtless be devised for dealing with this extremely delicate question. I should myself have preferred less democratic tribunals, but in the circumstances it was probably desirable that the tribunals should be filled in a democratic manner by the nominees of local representative bodies. Had the tribunals been constituted by barristers, or civil servants, or philosophers, or parsons or any other class

of "experts," they would doubtless have done less injustice, and said fewer foolish things, but it would have been much easier to excite popular feeling against their proceedings. I do not care further to discuss this question, which was not the subject of my letter. It would be impossible for any human tribunal to discriminate infallibly between the objector whose scruples deserve respect, and the objector who is merely (perhaps without knowing it) a coward, or a shirker, or a rebel. This is eminently a case in which "minorities must suffer." The only possible justice in such cases is a rough justice. Sorry as I am for the sufferers, I should be still more sorry for the thousands of brave men whom the objectors, by their refusal, would doom to death if Pacificism of this type were to have its way, and I hold that the duty of patriotism is one which needs at the present moment to be taught with some sternness.

H. RASHDALL.

New College, Oxford.

THE ETHICS OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

As Dr. Rashdall has pointed out in his unanswerable paper, there are some people too stupid to be amenable to argument on a given subject, and the odd thing is that they may be in other respects clever people.

One of their diseases is lack of imagination, and another is inability to distinguish ideas from facts, and what ought to be from what actually is. "Things are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be," as Bishop Butler said. What would as a matter of fact happen, if the Allies laid down their arms to-morrow? The Pacificist may think he knows, but all the rest of us know he is a fool, though it may be a very earnest and conscientious fool. But perhaps he is willing to risk all and "damn the consequences." He will act on Christian *principles*, and leave the result to God—and the Germans. Here his lack of imagination comes in usefully. He cannot realise what has been done in Belgium and elsewhere; and nothing short of seeing it will bring it home to him.

The result of his conduct on a sufficiently large scale would be not merely to hinder recruiting, but to stop all war, as he justly points out. Somebody must lead the way. St. Telemachus lost his life, but the gladiatorial shows were stopped. Excellent! but some sacrifices cost far more than they achieve; and besides, refusal to use strength in defence of weakness comes under a very different category. As Sir George Adam Smith said recently, "To put peace before justice, before the redemption of the slave, before the deliverance of the tortured, and the defence of the purity of women and children, is to turn Christianity upside down."

Teaching the Germans by "Christian methods" is a very beautiful dream, but much depends on whether it is at present within the range of practical politics. The Law came before the Gospel. To those who are not yet fully armed against Pacificist logic, may I recommend Canon Glazebrook's essay in *The Faith and the War*. I know nothing of its kind so convincing.

T. F. ROYDS.

Tushington Vicarage, Whitchurch, Salop.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

The subject of Canon Rashdall's article in your May issue is becoming one of increasing moral significance. He attributes to various mistakes "in ethical, and sometimes in political philosophy," all the varied objections to compulsory service put forward before the Tribunals—a "too literal reliance on the authority of Christ" is such a "mistake." The objectors are accused of taking His words as final guides without any appeal to the individual's own moral judgment. But to hold that all Quakers, for instance, are blind and slavish fanatics of this type is certainly not corroborated by history. It was largely their protest against a too liberal submission to the authority of the Bible which drove them in their thousands to jail and persecution in the 17th century, and those who have listened to many of the defences before the Tribunals will bear witness to a similar spirit to-day.

Is it not ungenerous, to say the least of it, to maintain that pacifists have "disobeyed their Master's express commands to bind up wounds?" If there are cases in which, on the grounds of prolonging the war, the "conscientious objectors" have refused the service of the Red Cross or the R.A.M.C., there are far more in which they have been refused such alternate service by the Tribunals. The civilian populations too of France, of Poland, of Armenia, of Servia, have much to say of the men who, though they did not wear a uniform, have risked their lives again and again to bind up their wounds, to rebuild their homes, to organise their relief, and that without any responsibility for carrying on the war.

Canon Rashdall regards the probable evil results of the "universal love" and "non-resistance" theory as sufficient refutation of its validity. He points to the position of Belgium as an example. But surely Belgium is destroyed, just because she did resist, and England helped her? If she had not resisted, she would have suffered no greater inconvenience than Greece is suffering now. The case of subject races is in a very different category. If ever there was occasion for fighting it is in such cases. But the result of the Balkan Wars, the first of which had so disinterested and noble an object, *i.e.*, the liberation of subject races, should make us pause before we glorify the method of war, even when its goal is deliverance from the oppressor. The objection to war as a satisfactory method of settling grievances cannot at least be summarily dismissed as it is by Canon Rashdall by the advice "to study history." History may be read in many different ways.

His contemptuous reference to the "much more numerous unconscientious objectors" is surely open to criticism, for is it likely, to say the least of it, that many men would be found who to avoid the horrors of war, are yet prepared by simulating moral objections, to face, not only the stern penalties so far frequently imposed, and the all but universal obloquy and scorn of their fellows, but the "relapse into sheer barbarism" of which the conscientious objectors are so often the victims?

But despised and disparaged as these humble people are, and by none more than by the Established Church, they are exercising a profound influence on the religious life and thought of their generation. A less stern and unyielding protest against the spirit of materialism in this, its crudest

expression of "militarism," would have failed to effect such an influence. They bear witness to the fact, however mistaken we may hold them to be in this particular instance, that to be a Christian means something more than a generally benevolent attitude to our neighbours, and a genial acceptance of the standards of the philanthropic world.

In the opinion of some of us, we as a Church, owe them a debt it is impossible to exaggerate for such witness. V. de B.

[The late Canon Capes, a deeply read historian, and a man of liberal and judicial temperament, said on one occasion, "There has been no great battle which has ever turned to the detriment of civilization."—Ed. *M.C.*]

CATHOLIC MODERNIST AND LIBERAL PROTESTANT.

Sir, *To the Editor of the* Modern Churchman.

In the review of Dr. Figgis's book, *The Fellowship of the Mystery*, in your last issue, the reviewer, after quoting a passage showing the writer's understanding of, and sympathy with, the modern mind, says :—

> "It seems a pity that holding such views as these, Dr. Figgis should have conceived so strong a prejudice against Liberal Churchmen. It is strange that one who can speak with appreciation of Tyrrell and the Roman Modernists, should fail as completely as he does, to do justice to his own communion."

The reviewer ignores the fact that the loose terms "Modernist" and "Liberal Churchman," cover a variety of points of view and shades of opinion, which however broadly considered, seem to resolve themselves into two distinct conceptions of the religion of the future. And these two conceptions arise, not, as so often happens, from the use of different word-symbols to express the fundamentally same idea; but from a radical difference in idea. Moreover the choice between these two ideas seems to present itself insistently to all who call themselves "Liberal" or "Modernist" to-day, and it turns on the question, "What think ye of Christ"?

Tyrrell ably represents the one conception, and his convictions on this vital question are clearly set forth in the following quotation from *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, and explain at once the appreciation and sympathy of Dr. Figgis. He says in the Preface :—

> "With all its accretions and perversions Catholicism is, for the Modernist, the only authentic Christianity. Whatever Jesus was, He was in no sense a liberal Protestant. All that makes Catholicism most repugnant to present modes of thought, derives from him. The difficulty is, not Catholicism, but Christ and Christianity. So far as other Christian bodies are true to Christ, they are faced by the same problems as are Modernists; if they escape them, it is because in defiance of history, they have shaped Christ to their own image, and see in Him no more than the Moslem sees in Mohammed."

Again at the end of the book he says:—

> "Jesus was not merely a revealed ideal of human personality, but a forceful, living, self-communicating ideal; a fire spreading itself from

soul to soul. . . . Those for whom He is a living indwelling Spirit, a fire kindling from soul to soul down the long centuries . . . . have no such trouble in the face of criticism. It is no more to them that He was a first century Jew in His mental outlook, than that He was a man and a carpenter. What they live by is, not His human mind, but His divine Spirit and personality revealed in conflict with His human limitations, and with ours, and with those of all generations to come. . . .

" . . . . The idea of Jesus as the Divine, indwelling and saving Spirit seems to me the very essence of Christianity. . . . . Christianity has but brought the inward principle of salvation to its highest degree of force and explicitness. Conscience, that is first dimly felt as a mysterious influence interfering with, and transcending the natural self and its laws, is revealed at last as the Spirit or Personality incarnate in Jesus. . . . . Take away this faith in Christ, and Catholicism ceases to be Christian, even though it still reverence Him as a founder, guide, and example.

"Given this faith in Christ, and we have Christianity even when the integral Catholic tradition is lacking, as in the uncritical Gospel-Christianity of so many of the sects."

Take as a representative of the other conception, Dr. Kirsopp Lake, a Protestant Modernist, equally concerned for the religion of the future. In his *Stewardship of Faith*, with its masterly survey of the growth of the Catholic Church and the various currents of thought by which it was influenced, he seems always to speak of the personality of Jesus in the past tense, putting Him entirely back into His historic surroundings and keeping Him there, though always recognising His unique position and influence as the Founder and inspirer of Christianity.

Dr. Lake says in Chapter II. on the Teaching of Jesus:—

" Religion . . . . may be regarded as conversation between the Heavenly Father and His children. But that conversation is not carried on without difficulty or effort on the part of the children. It is their natural but mistaken instinct to try to find some way of escaping that difficulty and effort. For the striving in personal religion they have tried to substitute an infallible Church, an infallible Bible, an infallible historic Jesus. But all these have failed us, and we are driven back to a living religion of communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort . . . . in the end if men have but faith, ... in the guidance of life . . . . they come back to the Church and find in it a community of men who in every age have known best and described best, what religion was to them.

" They come back to the Bible, and find in it a collection of writings which have given classic expression to some of the secrets of spiritual life. They come back to the historic Jesus, and find, not an infallible escape from all those 'modern difficulties,' which are their own, for them to solve, but a guide who shows them the ultimate values of life, lifts them—if only for a moment—above the details of daily duty and reveals to them the eternal verities, in order that they may

return to the work of the world . . . . and work out the problems of this 'interim' existence in the light of the vision which they have seen."

And in Chapter VII. he sums up the Modernist position as he interprets it on this subject, thus:—

"The Modernist worships the Logos: not because of any ecclesiastical authority, but because heart and mind agree to tell him that this is the way of truth in which his fathers walked. He is not prepared to narrow down his preception of the Logos in all time and in all life, in order to obtain a spurious heightening of contrast for the recognition which he gives to the Logos in Jesus."

These passages serve to show the difference of outlook involved in the two points of view. And although between these two extremes there exist very many gradations of thought, yet again and again we are brought "up against" these two alternatives, this choice of a basis for future religious life and work in the changed world that is coming.

Shall we remain in the Fellowship of that mystery—the dynamic of the living Christ, the consumate expression of the Logos for all time? Shall we work and pray for the Empire of Christ, as an ideal not incompatible with the widest liberalism and receptiveness of mind; in the conviction that each fuller revelation and vision of the glory of God yet to be given to man will still be seen in the face of Jesus Christ?

Or, is our future stewardship to be that of a Faith in which the distinctively Christian position will be but a spiritual provincialism, a Christology which has served its purpose as a valuable and unique factor up to the present in the progress of religion, but is now a confessed illusion? Are we to work towards a higher synthesis than Christianity provides, a super-Christianity which will be more adequate for the needs of the future than the traditional conception can be?

K. Morley Horder.

A MODERN CHURCHMAN'S SACRAMENTS.

Sir, *To the Editor of* The Modern Churchman.

Surely, in his article, Mr. Cunningham Craig misses the essential point. A most central and essential element in the Christian religion, rightly understood, is the sense of belonging to a definite body, the visible Church, the special family of God on earth, the fellowship of the mystery. This is no mere question of practical expediency. This sense of the fellowship, and of the obligations to which we are committed by our membership of it, enters into the very heart of our religion and profoundly conditions its inmost character, viewed from the most deeply religious aud truly spiritual standpoint.

But a visible Church necessitates Sacraments. In particular, a ceremony of admission and a recurring act of fellowship would seem to be indispensable. The particular character of these may be a historical accident, though, as regards the second, a family seems necessarily to involve a family meal of some kind. When Mr. Craig says:—"If Christian people were in perfect charity one with another, then we should not require that

common participation at the Table of the Lord to realise our brotherhood one with another," he is surely overlooking the fairly obvious fact that outward and even formal *expressions* of fellowship and affection are largely an end in themselves. If we loved one another perfectly, should we shake hands and kiss less than we do now?

The rather grudging acquiescence in Sacraments, the evident wish that we were spiritual enough to do without them, the apparent hint that one day, even on earth, we may be so, which mark Mr. Craig's article, seem to some of us to indicate distinct defects in his outlook. If all Churchpeople realised as they should the *family* character of the Church into which they have enjoyed the glorious privilege of entry by their Baptism, they would never wantonly absent themselves from the family meal. The non-communicant Churchman is a very gross anomaly which liberals should be as eager to abolish (of course by persuasive, not by coercive, methods) as the narrowest sacerdotalist. Mr. Craig's whole attitude towards the subject betrays that excessive individualism and deficiency of Church consciousness which, unfortunately, characterise too many Broad or Modern Churchmen.

24, *Lime Grove*,
Uxbridge Road, W.

N. E. EGERTON SWANN.

[The Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig's article in this issue will probably furnish the explanation our correspondent desires. Perhaps we may add that very strong emphasis on the Sacraments has tended to make the Christian religion materialistic, mechanical, and magical. Christian love and fellowship have not been so conspicuous in Sacramentarian bodies as among the Quakers. Church History shows that bloody wars and bitter persecutions have risen out of disputes about the Sacrament of Christian fellowship. Modern historical criticism makes it doubtful whether Christ did command the celebration of the Eucharist by his disciples for all time.

The knowledge of these facts combined with the reflection that Sacraments are means to an end, and that Christ's test of discipleship was, "By their fruits ye shall know them," make the modern Churchman hesitate to put great emphasis on the Sacraments. As a clergyman, he desires his parishioners to use them rightly, but he is much more concerned to see them exhibit in their lives those gifts and graces which the Sacraments symbolise.—ED. *M.C.*]

THE NATIONAL MISSION.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

A Committee has been appointed by the Council of the Churchmen's Union to consider questions connected with the National Mission, more particularly as affecting members of the Union, and liberal Churchmen in general. I have been asked to act as convener and secretary of this Committee, and it will be a great help if suggestions, or information with regard to points which we ought to take into consideration, could be sent to me as soon as possible.

C. W. EMMET.

West Hendred Vicarage, Steventon, Berks.

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.